arXiv:1611.06414v1 [math.NT] 19 Nov 2016

An upper bound for weak B_k–sets

By

Tomasz Schoen* and Ilya D. Shkredov

Abstract

We prove that if $A \subseteq [N]$ does not contain any solution to the equation $x_1 + \dots + x_k = y_1 + \dots + y_k$ with distinct $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k \in A$, then $|A| \ll k^{3/2} N^{1/k}$.

1 Introduction

A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ is called a B_k–set, $k \geqslant 2$, if

$$x_1 + \dots + x_k = y_1 + \dots + y_k \tag{1}$$

with $x_i, y_i \in A$ implies that $x_1, \dots, x_k$ is a permutation of $y_1, \dots, y_k$. If A is a B_k-subsets of $[N]$, then even a simple argument argument $\binom{|A|+k-1}{k} = |kA| \leqslant kN$ shows that

$$|A| \leqslant (kk!)^{1/k} N^{1/k}.$$

Currently best bound

$$|A| \leqslant (1+o(1))(1+\varepsilon_k)\frac{k}{2e} N^{1/k}$$

was proved by Green [4] (see also [5] page 14), where $\varepsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. The history of the problem and bibliography can be found in [5].

We call a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ a weak B_k–set (B_k^*–set) if every solution to (1) with $x_i \in A$ implies that among numbers $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k$ at least two are equal. In other words A does not contain a solution to (1) with distinct elements. It is already non-trivial to prove that every B_k^*–subset of $[N]$ has size $O_k(N^{1/k})$. It is a fact that there are equations (see Theorem 3.3 in [6]) such that the threshold for the size of a set without solutions in distinct integers is of different order of magnitude. Ruzsa [6] proved that for every B_k^*–set $A \subseteq [N]$ we have

$$|A| \leqslant (1+o(1))k^{2-1/k} N^{1/k}\,.$$

*The author is supported by NSC grant ...

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: primary 11B99.

Very recently Timmons [7] showed that

$$|A| \leqslant (1+o(1))(1+\varepsilon_k)\frac{k^2}{4}N^{1/k},$$

where $\varepsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. On the other hand, for $k \geqslant 3$ Timmons constructed a B_k^*–subset of $[N]$ with $(1-o(1))2^{1-1/k}N^{1/k}$ elements. Our aim is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Let $A \subseteq [N]$ be a B_k^*–set and $N \geqslant (2k^{9/2})^k$. Then*

$$|A| \leqslant 16k^{3/2}N^{1/k}\,.$$

2 The proof of the main result

For a finite subset of integers A put

$$\sigma_k(n) = \sigma_k(n;A) = |\{(x_1,\dots,x_k) \in A^k : x_1+\dots+x_k = n\}|\,,$$

$$f(t) = f_A(t) = \sum_{a\in A} e^{-2\pi i a t}\,, \qquad t \in [0,1]$$

further

$$M_k = M_k(A) = \sum_n \sigma_k(n)^2 = \int_0^1 |f(t)|^{2k}dt\,,$$

$$s_k(n) = s_k(n;A) = |\{(x_1,\dots,x_k) \in A^k,\, x_i \neq x_j : x_1+\dots+x_k = n\}|,$$

$$S_k = S_k(A) = \sum_n s_k(n;A)^2 = \sum_n s_k(n)^2 =$$

$$= |\{(x_1,\dots,x_k,y_1,\dots,y_k) \in A^{2k} \ :\ x_1+\dots+x_k = y_1+\dots+y_k,\, x_i \neq x_j,\, y_i \neq y_j\}|\,. \qquad (2)$$

Furthermore, define

$$S_k^*(A) = |\{(x_1,\dots,x_k,y_1,\dots,y_k) \in A^{2k} \ :\ x_1+\dots+x_k = y_1+\dots+y_k,\\ x_i \neq x_j,\, y_i \neq y_j,\, x_i \neq y_j,\, 1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k\}|\,.$$

and for finite subsets of integers A_1, A_2 put

$$S_k^*(A_1,A_2) = |\{(x_1,\dots,x_k,y_1,\dots,y_k) \in A_1^k \times A_2^k \ :\ x_1+\dots+x_k = y_1+\dots+y_k,\\ x_i \neq x_j,\, y_i \neq y_j,\, x_i \neq y_j,\, 1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k\}|\,.$$

Clearly, A is a B_k^*–set A if and only if $S_k^*(A) = 0$

Our first lemma can be extracted from Ruzsa's paper [6]. We will rewrite it for a convenient for us form.

Lemma 2 *Let A be a finite set of integers with $|A| \geqslant 16k^4$. Then*

$$2^{-k}k!|A|^k \leqslant S_k \leqslant M_k \leqslant 2S_k\,. \qquad (3)$$

P r o o f. If $k = 1$, then the result is trivial, thus suppose that $k \geqslant 2$. First observed that

$$M_k \geqslant S_k \geqslant k!|A|(|A|-1)\dots(|A|-k+1) \geqslant (5/4)^{-k}k!|A|^k \geqslant 2^{-k}k!|A|^k\,. \qquad (4)$$

Ruzsa proved (see inequality (5.8) in [6]) that

$$\sum_n (\sigma_k(n) - s_k(n))^2 \leqslant k^4 M_{k-1}\,,$$

hence by the Hölder inequality

$$\sum_n (\sigma_k(n) - s_k(n))^2 \leqslant k^4 M_k^{\frac{k-2}{k-1}}|A|^{\frac{1}{k-1}}\,.$$

Therefore, by the triangle inequality

$$M_k^{1/2} \leqslant S_k^{1/2} + k^2 M_k^{\frac{k-2}{2(k-1)}}|A|^{\frac{1}{2(k-1)}}\,.$$

By the middle inequality in (4) and the assumption $|A| \geqslant 16k^4$ we see that

$$|M_k^{1/2} - S_k^{1/2}|^2 \leqslant k^4 M_k^{\frac{k-2}{k-1}}|A|^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \leqslant 2^{-4}M_k$$

so that

$$M_k \leqslant 2S_k$$

as required. ■

Observe that, actually, the inequality (3) can be strengthened to $M_k = S_k(1 + o(1))$ for large $|A|$. Our next lemma provides a straightforward relation between S_k and S_l for $l < k$.

Lemma 3 *Let $1 \leqslant l < k$ and let A be a B_k^*–set with $|A| \geqslant 16k^4$. Then*

$$S_k \leqslant (\sqrt{2}k)^{2(k-l)}|A|^{k-l}S_l\,.$$

P r o o f. Indeed, counting the number of the solutions to (2), we see that by the assumption on A we must have $x_i = y_j$ for some i and j. There are at most k^2 choices for i and j and thus

$$S_k \leqslant k^2|A|S_{k-1} \leqslant k^2|A|M_{k-1}\,. \qquad (5)$$

Furthermore, by the Hölder inequality and Lemma 2

$$M_{k-1} = \int_0^1 |f(t)|^{2k-2}dt \leqslant \Big(\int_0^1 |f(t)|^{2k}dt\Big)^{\frac{k-l-1}{k-l}} \Big(\int_0^1 |f(t)|^{2l}dt\Big)^{\frac{1}{k-l}} \leqslant (2S_k)^{\frac{k-l-1}{k-l}}(2S_l)^{\frac{1}{k-l}}\,,$$

hence by (5)

$$S_k \leqslant 2k^2|A|S_k^{\frac{k-l-1}{k-l}}S_l^{\frac{1}{k-l}}$$

and the assertion follows. ■

Using a simple probabilistic argument we prove that the variables from both sides of (2) can be chosen from disjoint sets. This allows us to apply a version of a well known theorem of Erdős–Ko–Rado, see Theorem 6 below.

Lemma 4 *Let A be finite set of integers. Then there exists a set $A' \subseteq A$ such that*

$$S_k^*(A) \leqslant 4^k S_k^*(A', A\setminus A')\,.$$

P r o o f. Let us pick, randomly, independently, each element of A with probability $1/2$. Let A' be the random set of chosen elements. Clearly,

$$\mathbb{E}S_k^*(A', A\setminus A') = \sum_{x_1+\dots+x_k=x'_1+\dots+x'_k} 2^{-2k}\,,$$

where the summation is taken over all solutions in the set A with distinct integers. Whence,

$$\mathbb{E}S_k^*(A', A\setminus A') = 4^{-k}S_k^*(A)\,,$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\, S_k^*(A', A\setminus A') \geqslant 4^{-k}S_k^*(A)\,\big) > 0\,.$$

Therefore, there is a specific choice of A' such that $S_k^*(A) \leqslant 4^k S_k^*(A', A\setminus A')$. ■

For a B_k^*–set A define

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(A) = \{j\in[k] \;:\; A \text{ is a } B_j^*\text{–set}\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}(A) = [k]\setminus\mathcal{G}(A)\,.$$

Timmons [7] proved that a large subset of A is a $B^*_{\lfloor k/2\rfloor}$ or $B^*_{\lceil k/2\rceil}$–set. We prove that there is a large set $B\subseteq A$ such that the set $\mathcal{G}(B)$ is very large and structural. This is a crucial argument in our approach.

Lemma 5 *Let A be a B_k^*–set. Then there is a set $B\subseteq A$,*

$$|B| \geqslant |A| - 2k^3$$

such that for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}(B)$, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(B)$ we have for any l we have $l\mathcal{X}\cap\mathcal{G} = \emptyset$. In particular,

$$|\mathcal{X}\cap[l]| \leqslant \Big\lfloor\frac{l}{2}\Big\rfloor \tag{6}$$

for every $1\leqslant l\leqslant k$.

P r o o f. We prove the lemma using an iterative procedure. We start with the sets $A_0 = A$, $\mathcal{G}_0 = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{X}_0 = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{S}_0 = \emptyset$. Suppose that we have chosen $A_i, \mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{X}_i$ and $\mathcal{S}_i$. If $[k] = \mathcal{G}_i \cup \mathcal{X}_i$ we stop the process, otherwise put $l := \min([k] \setminus (\mathcal{G}_i \cup \mathcal{X}_i))$. If A_i contains k pairwise disjoint solutions to the equation

$$x_1 + \dots + x_l = y_1 + \dots + y_l \qquad (7)$$

with all variables distinct, and disjoint with $\mathcal{S}_i$, then we put

$$A_{i+1} = A_i, \;\; \mathcal{G}_{i+1} = \mathcal{G}_i, \;\; \mathcal{X}_{i+1} = \mathcal{X}_i \cup \{l\}, \;\; \mathcal{S}_{i+1} = \mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathsf{Sol}_i \,, \qquad (8)$$

where Sol_i is the set of all numbers involved in the k disjoint solutions to (7). If this is not the case (there are less than k such solutions), let Sol_i be a maximal collection of pairwise disjoint solutions to (7) with distinct variables, and disjoint with $\mathcal{S}_i$. Then we put

$$A_{i+1} = A_i \setminus (\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathsf{Sol}_i), \;\; \mathcal{G}_{i+1} = \mathcal{G}_i \cup \{l\}, \;\; \mathcal{X}_{i+1} = \emptyset, \;\; \mathcal{S}_{i+1} = \emptyset \,. \qquad (9)$$

Observe that then A_{i+1} is a B_l^*–set, and $l \in \mathcal{G}_j$, for all $j \geqslant i+1$. Thus, the step (9) can be applied at most k times, as in each application we add one element to the set $\mathcal{G}_i$. Therefore, the process must terminate after $m \leqslant k^2$ iterations. We put $B = A_m, \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_m$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_m$. Since $|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathsf{Sol}_i| \leqslant 2k^2$ it follows that

$$|B| \geqslant |A| - 2k^3.$$

Next, we prove that $l\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$. Suppose that it does not hold. Then there exist $n_1, \dots, n_l \in \mathcal{X}$, $l \leqslant k$, such that $n_1 + \dots + n_l = n \in \mathcal{G}$. By our construction there are pairwise disjoint solutions in distinct integers

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x_1^{(1)} + \dots + x_{n_1}^{(1)} & = & y_1^{(1)} + \dots + y_{n_1}^{(1)} \\ & \dots & \\ x_1^{(l)} + \dots + x_{n_l}^{(l)} & = & y_1^{(l)} + \dots + y_{n_l}^{(l)}. \end{array}$$

Summing all these solutions up we obtain a solution to the equation

$$x_1 + \dots + x_n = y_1 + \dots + y_n$$

in distinct integers $x_i, y_i \in B$, which contradicts that B is a B_n^*–set.

It remains to prove (6). Observe that if $l \in \mathcal{G}$ it follows from $2\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$ that

$$|\mathcal{X} \cap [l]| \leqslant \lceil \frac{l}{2} \rceil - 1 \leqslant \lfloor \frac{l-1}{2} \rfloor \,,$$

otherwise there are $n_1, n_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $n_1 + n_2 = l$, which is impossible. Now, let $l \in \mathcal{X}$ and suppose that $|\mathcal{X} \cap [l]| > \lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor$. Let n be the smallest element of $\mathcal{G}$ bigger than l. Then

$$\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil - 1 \geqslant |\mathcal{X} \cap [n]| = |\mathcal{X} \cap [n-1]| > \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor \,,$$

which again is a contradiction. This completes the proof. ■

Clearly, the property $l\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{G} = \emptyset$ means that if $x_1, \dots, x_l \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $x_1 + \dots + x_l \in [k]$ then automatically $x_1 + \dots + x_l \in \mathcal{X}$. Potential examples of "bad" $\mathcal{X}$ is the set of even numbers from $[k]$ or $\mathcal{X} = (k/2, k-1]$. However, we do not know any example of a dense B_k^*–subset of $[N]$ that does not contain a large subset that is B_l^*–set for every $l \leqslant k$.

In the proof of the main result we also apply a variant of a well–known theorem of Erdős–Ko–Rado [2], [3]. Let $1 \leqslant k, n$, $k < n$ be integer parameters and let $L = \{l_1 < l_2 < \dots < l_r\} \subseteq [0, k]$. A family $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of $[n]$ is called (n, k, L)–system if, each of a subset of the family has cardinality k and, for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ from the family we have $|A \cap B| \in L$. The following theorem was proved in [1].

Theorem 6 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a (n, k, L)–system. Then*

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leqslant \prod_{i=1}^{|L|} \frac{n - l_i}{k - l_i}\,.$$

Now we are in position to prove Theorem 1. It is a consequence of the following result.

Theorem 7 *Let A be a B_k^*–set, $|A| \geqslant 20k^6$. Then*

$$M_k(A) \leqslant 2k8^k k^{3k/2} |A|^k\,. \qquad (10)$$

To see how the theorem above implies Theorem 1 just apply (10) and note that by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality one has

$$|A|^{2k} = \Big(\sum_n \sigma_k(n)\Big)^2 \leqslant |kA| \sum_n \sigma_k^2(n) \leqslant 2k8^k k^{3k/2} |A|^k kN\,,$$

hence

$$|A| \leqslant 16k^{3/2} N^{1/k}$$

as required.

P r o o f. Let $B \subseteq A$ be a set given by Lemma 5. By the Minkowski inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_k^{1/2k}(A) &= \big(\int_0^1 |f(t)|^{2k} dt\big)^{1/2k} \leqslant \big(\int_0^1 |f_B(t)|^{2k} dt\big)^{1/2k} + \big(\int_0^1 |f_{A\setminus B}(t)|^{2k} dt\big)^{1/2k} \\ &\leqslant M_k^{1/2k}(B) + M_k^{1/2k}(A \setminus B)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|A \setminus B| \leqslant 2k^3$, it follows that $M_k^{1/2k}(A \setminus B) \leqslant 2k^3$. Furthermore, by the first inequality in (3), we get

$$M_k^{1/2k}(B) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}(20k^6 - 2k^3)^{1/2} \geqslant 2k^3 \geqslant M_k^{1/2k}(A \setminus B)\,,$$

so that

$$M_k(A) \leqslant 2^k M_k(B)\,.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2 it is enough to estimate the quantity $S_k(B)$.

Put $t = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and observe that (the formula below works for any $t \leqslant k$)

$$S_t = S_t(B) = \sum_{l=2}^{t} \binom{t}{l}^2 (t-l)! S^*_l(B) |B|^{t-l} + t!|B|^t. \qquad (11)$$

Indeed, notice that from every solution to the equation

$$x_1 + \dots + x_t = y_1 + \dots + y_t \qquad (12)$$

in B with $x_i \neq x_j$ and $y_i \neq y_j$, after cancelation of all equal variables from both sides, we obtain for some $l < t$, a solution to the equation

$$x_{i_1} + \dots + x_{i_l} = y_{i_1} + \dots + y_{i_l} \qquad (13)$$

with distinct integers $x_{i_j}, y_{i_j} \in B$. Conversely, each solution to the equation (12) must be constructed from a solution to (13) for some $2 \leqslant l \leqslant t$, and by adding to both sides of the equation the same elements from B. This can be done on $\binom{t}{l}^2 (t-l)!$ ways, as for a fixed solution $(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_l}, y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_l})$ we have to chose positions for x_{i_j}, y_{i_j} on $\binom{t}{l}^2$ ways, and then to chose distinct $t-l$ elements from B and order them on the right hand side of the equation on $(t-l)!$ ways. The term $t!|B|^t$ counts the number of solutions with $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\} = \{y_1, \dots, y_t\}$.

Next, applying Lemma 4 we bound $S^*_l(B)$. Let B' be a set given by Lemma 4. To estimate $S^*_l(B', B \setminus B')$ observe that every solution to (13), say, $(x_1, \dots, x_l, y_1, \dots, y_l), x_i \in B', y_i \in B \setminus B'$ corresponds to a set $Z = \{x_1, \dots, x_l, y_1, \dots, y_l\}$, and clearly, each such set with $\sum x_i = \sum y_i$, gives $(l!)^2$ solutions to (13). Thus, to bound $S^*_l(B', B \setminus B')$ it is sufficient to bound the number of such sets Z. Denote by $\mathcal{A}_l$ the family of all sets Z that corresponds to a solution to (13).

Put $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}(B)$, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(B)$. By (6) we have $|\mathcal{X} \cap [l]| \leqslant \lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor$ for every $1 \leqslant l \leqslant k$. Suppose that we have two solutions to (13)

$$x_1 + \dots + x_a + y_1 + \dots + y_{l-a} = x'_1 + \dots + x'_b + y'_1 + \dots + y'_{l-b}$$

$$\tilde{x}_1 + \dots + \tilde{x}_a + \tilde{y}_1 + \dots + \tilde{y}_{l-a} = \tilde{x}'_1 + \dots + \tilde{x}'_b + \tilde{y}'_1 + \dots + \tilde{y}'_{l-b}\,,$$

where $0 \leqslant a \leqslant l$, $0 \leqslant b \leqslant l$, further, $\{x_1, \dots, x_a\} = \{\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_a\}$, $\{x'_1, \dots, x'_b\} = \{\tilde{x}'_1, \dots, \tilde{x}'_b\}$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_{l-a}\} \cap \{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_{l-a}\} = \emptyset$, $\{y'_1, \dots, y'_{l-b}\} \cap \{\tilde{y}'_1, \dots, \tilde{y}'_{l-b}\} = \emptyset$. The above solutions correspond to some sets Z_1, $Z_2 \subseteq [B]^{2l}$ and we have $|Z_1 \cap Z_2| = a+b$. Subtracting our solutions, we get

$$y_1 + \dots + y_{l-a} + \tilde{y}'_1 + \dots + \tilde{y}'_{l-b} = y'_1 + \dots + y'_{l-b} + \tilde{y}_1 + \dots + \tilde{y}_{l-a}\,. \qquad (14)$$

Because of $\{y_1, \dots, y_{l-a}\} \cap \{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_{l-a}\} = \emptyset$, $\{y'_1, \dots, y'_{l-b}\} \cap \{\tilde{y}'_1, \dots, \tilde{y}'_{l-b}\} = \emptyset$ we to see that (14) is a solution with distinct elements from B. Therefore, $2l - |Z_1 \cap Z_2| \in \mathcal{X}$, so that $|Z_1 \cap Z_2| \in (2l - \mathcal{X})$. Putting $L = 2l - \mathcal{X} = \{l_1 < \dots < l_r\} \subseteq [0, 2l]$, $r = |\mathcal{X} \cap [2l]| \leqslant l$, we see that the family $\mathcal{A}_l$ is a $(|B|, 2l, L)$–system. Using Theorem 6, we obtain

$$|\mathcal{A}_l| \leqslant \prod_{i=1}^{|L|} \frac{|B| - l_i}{2l - l_i} \leqslant \frac{|B|^r}{r!} \leqslant \frac{|B|^l}{l!}\,.$$

Thus,

$$S_l^*(B', B \setminus B') \leqslant \frac{|B|^l}{l!} \cdot (l!)^2 = l!|B|^l \,,$$

so that by Lemma 4

$$S_l^*(B) \leqslant 4^l l!|B|^l \,.$$

Therefore by (11)

$$S_t(B) \leqslant 4^t t!|B|^t \sum_{l=0}^{t} \binom{t}{l} = 8^t t!|B|^t \,.$$

Applying Lemma 3 with $l = t$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_k(B) &\leqslant (\sqrt{2}k)^{2(k-t)}|B|^{k-t}S_t(B) \\ &\leqslant 8^t t!(\sqrt{2}k)^{2(k-t)}|B|^k \\ &\leqslant 2^{k+2t}k^{2k-t}|B|^k \\ &\leqslant k4^k k^{3k/2}|B|^k \,, \end{aligned}$$

hence by

$$M_k(A) \leqslant 2^k M_k(B) \leqslant 2^{k+1}S_k(B) \leqslant 2k8^k k^{3k/2}|B|^k \leqslant 2k8^k k^{3k/2}|A|^k \,,$$

which completes the proof. ■

References

[1] M. DEZA, P. ERDŐS, AND P. FRANKL, *Intersection properties of systems of finite sets,* Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 36 (1978), 369–384.

[2] P. ERDŐS, AND R. RADO, *Intersection theorems for systems of sets,* J. London Math. Soc. 35 (1960), 85–90.

[3] P. ERDŐS, C. KO, AND R. RADO, *Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets,* Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2) 12 (1961), 313–320.

[4] B. GREEN, *The number of squares and $B_h[g]$ sets,* Acta Arith. 100 (2001), 365–390.

[5] K. O' BRYANT, *A complete annotated bibliography or work related to Sidon sequences,* Electronic J. of Combinatorics DS 11, v. 575 (2004).

[6] I. Z. RUZSA, *Solving a linear equation in a set of integers I,* Acta Arith. 65 (1993), 259–282.

[7] C. M. TIMMONS, *Upper and lower bounds on B_k^+-sets,* Integers 255 (2014), 55–70.

[8] T. TAO AND V. VU, *Additive Combinatorics,* Cambridge University Press (2006).

T. Schoen
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Adam Mickiewicz University,
Umultowska 87, 61-614 Poznań, Poland
schoen@amu.edu.pl

I.D. Shkredov
Steklov Mathematical Institute,
ul. Gubkina, 8, Moscow, Russia, 119991
and
IITP RAS,
Bolshoy Karetny per. 19, Moscow, Russia, 127994
and
MIPT,
Institutskii per. 9, Dolgoprudnii, Russia, 141701
ilya.shkredov@gmail.com